DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 317 061 FL 018 407

AUTHOR Kernberger, Carolyn
TITLE Just Say No to He/Men, or Teaching Nonsexist Language in the ESL Classroom.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the New Mexico Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (Las Cruces, February 16-17, 1990).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Diachronic Linguistics; *English (Second Language); *Language Role; Pronouns; *Second Language Instruction; *Sex Bias
IDENTIFIERS *Gender (Language)

ABSTRACT

A discussion of the teaching of nonsexist language to learners of English as a Second Language (ESL) reviews the history of the awareness of gender bias in language, outlines the arguments for and against nonsexist language teaching, and concludes in favor of nonsexist language use in the second language classroom. It is proposed that those individuals who promote the use of sexist language should be called on to defend its underlying value system. The use of "he" and "man" and their derivatives to refer to people or animals of both sexes is seen as inaccurate. It is argued that while in formal writing, a pronoun should agree with its antecedent in both number and gender, the situation in speech is not parallel. The "singular they" is used widely and facilitates clear communication among native speakers, and should therefore be taught to ESL students as one acceptable form of pronoun usage. A 21-item reference list and brief bibliography are included, and appended materials consist of citations for the advocacy of nonsexist language use by professional organizations, journals, style manuals, textbooks, dictionaries, other publications, and English teachers. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED317061

FL

Just Say No To He/Men, or Teaching Nonsexist Language in the ESL Classroom

Carolyn Kernberger

University of New Mexico

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C. Kernberger
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL018407

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

	page
Introduction	1
History	3
Arguments For	9
Arguments Against	11
Author's Viewpoint	15
References	17

Just Say No To He/Men, or
Teaching Nonsexist Language
in the ESL Classroom

Introduction

As I culminate my formal studies of the teaching of English, specifically as a second language, I find that I have become particularly conscious of the frequent discrepancy between a message which is sent (encoded) and the message which is received (decoded). This discrepancy arises primarily because of two reasons. First, lack of precision in usage, and second, lack of consensus between the sender and the receiver about the connotation and denotation of the words used. Cross-cultural communication provides fertile breeding grounds for misunderstanding on both these counts.

Studies in crosscultural communication prompt us to recall that even though it may be a bit strong to say that a culture's language <u>determines</u> the thought and behavior patterns of its people, it is generally accepted that language certainly <u>influences</u> them (Martyna, 1980). Transmitting cultural values and definitions of reality is integral with language teaching, but just as teachers have the choice of transmitting the value of cultural pluralism over ethnocentrism by the way the language is used, the value of sexism is reinforced by the use of sexist language.

Nonsexist language can be defined as that which does not show prejudice on the basis of gender, or that which does not suggest traditional stereotypes of appropriateness by gender. Volumes have been written and spoken about the many ways language reflects sexism. This paper will be confined to a discussion of the usage of "he" and "man" and their derivatives used as "generics."

English is said to have "natural gender," in which things are referred to with masculine or feminine terms only when biologically correct, as opposed to languages such as German and Spanish, which have "grammatical gender." To purport to a class learning English as a second language that when the gender of someone being referred to is unknown, they should use the masculine, is an assertion of male precedence in our value system.

This is so not just because of the surface meaning, that some claim can be interpreted as "generic," but because of the imagery generated in the minds of the readers and listeners. Stevick (1986) discusses the role of imagery in language teaching. He discusses the complexity with which imagery (not only visual but images invoking other dimensions such as time, purpose, and emotion) interacts with previous experiences to establish a solid network of language reference in the brain. What are the mental images created in the minds of the receivers with the usage of "he," "his," "him," "man," and "men"? Are they truly generic words even when intended to be so by the sender?

History

Language is dynamic. Speakers of a language vary it to meet their needs. English pronouns have been through many changes through the years, including the elimination of "thou" and "thee." Even though our culture has historically been a patriarchy, we can look back to see that English speakers themselves had the common sense to realize that saying "he" did not include the "she's."

Bodine (1975) maintains that 19th century grammarians, in analyzing usage patterns to derive a new prescriptive grammar, incorrectly assessed "they" as being used only as plural in meaning. They were then free to select "he" as the only correct singular pronoun (when gender was unknown), fortifying the patriarchal order.

Miller and Swift (1980) assert that "the masculine-gender pronouns that were used in grammatical examples in setting forth grammars ... did not reflect a belief that masculine pronouns could refer to both sexes. They reflected the reality of male cultural dominance and the male-centered world view that resulted. Males were perceived as the standard representatives of the human species, females as something else" (p. 36). The male prescriptive grammarians of the 18th century put forth the idea that the male should linguistically be assumed to be the standard of the species, flatly stating that the reason for it was because the masculine gender was "the more worthy gender" (Cheshire, 1985). In 1850 the British Parliament

even gave official sanction to the use of the "generic he" in its legislative language (Bodine, 1975).

The pragmatic effect of such actions was that those in power (men) utilized the ambiguity to exclude women or include them, as it suited their purposes. Spender (1985) says that sexist usage essentially makes females "linguistically invisible ... so that it seems reasonable to assume the world is male until proven otherwise" (p.157).

Many discriminatory practices have been continued because the words "man" and "he" were interpreted, accurately enough, as male references. In 1975, the US Department of Labor responded to cases of job discrimination based on the usage of "he" and "man" by rewriting the job descriptions in the Dictionary of Occupational Titles with nonsexist language (Miller & Swift, 1980).

The women's movement gave birth to a new awareness of the sexism in English in the 1970's, and the issue of the "generic" use of "he" and "man" came to the fore. Appendix A details the responses of those professional organizations, journals, and style manuals most responsible for determining "correct usage." Appendix B details the conflicting ways in which various authors have chosen to incorporate nonsexist language into grammar textbooks. Appendix C shows a sampling of the discussions of usage in reference books, reflecting the state of flux the language is in. Appendix D shows what is really published, reflected in the reality of editing by the Publications of the Modern Language

Association, and usage in professional language teaching books. Appendix E documents recently published examples of "they" as singular, and Appendix F offers a glimpse of how English teachers in higher education handle this issue. These statements, more than bland observations of "differences in usage," fiercely reflect the lack of unanimity about the issue among those involved with language professionally.

Background for understanding this issue necessarily involves discussing the ambiguity of the uses of "he" and "man" (and their derivatives), including switching back and forth from a "general" use to the "specific," and research into the imagery generated by these words.

"Bud: What would you do if a man-eating
tiger chased you?
Meg: Nothing, I'm a girl."

Why did the above appear in a 1964 Scholastic joke book for children? Because ambiguity in our language is often funny. Now consider the following familiar syllogism from philosophy and logic:

All men are mortal.
Socrates is a man.
Therefore, Socrates is mortal.

The usage of "men" in the top line is of the type usually said to be "generic," or applying to all people. However, there is a switch in the second line to the use of "man" as specifically male. If this were not so, the following would not sound incongruous to most people:

All men are mortal.

Mary is a man.

Therefore, Mary is mortal.

Moulton (1980) argues that if "man" truly has a gender-neutral meaning, it should retain it regardless of the gender of the referent, as do "human being" or "person." She maintains that the usage has shifted from one meaning to another, invalidating the syllogism, just as in this example:

All banks are closed on Sunday.

The banks of the Yukon River are banks.

Therefore, the banks of the Yukon River are closed on Sunday.

But the fact that we consider the syllogism about Socrates to be valid and that we consider statements like its first statement to be gender-neutral shows that we are frequently misled about neutral uses (Moulton, 1980).

Consider a sentence likely to have been found in a biology text not too far in the past:

Man is a mammal.

Its intent was clearly intended to be general to the species, yet continuing the description, to:

Man, being a mammal, breastfeeds his young.

demonstrates its incongruity as a "generic." Martyna (1980) argues that it is not that these terms cannot be used generically, but that they allow both specific and general interpretation, even in a context which should force a generic interpretation.

Miller and Swift (1980) discuss the tendency for writers to slip back and forth between the general and the specific. Some writers may say they are including females in their usage of "man," but it seems that the imagery is even too much for them to overcome, and they slip into using it specifically. Spender (1985) cites Graham as concluding: "In practice, the sexist assumption that man is a species of males becomes the fact. Erich Fromm certainly seemed to think so when he wrote that man's 'vital interests' were 'life, food, access to females...'" (p. 155).

A shift in meaning usually takes places smoothly, unless the shift is noticeable or humorous (as in the above examples). Moulton (1980) maintains that it is only noted when the gender-neutral use is attempted and fails, but otherwise we cannot always tell when the shift is taking place. This results in the reader developing images that perpetuate the notion that the male is the standard of the species.

The role of imagery in language is pervasive. Henley (1987) cites 16 research studies published between 1971 and 1986 that show consistently that "he" most readily produces male images in the minds of both sexes. In other words, to the receivers of the message, it is not functioning "generically." In a widely cited study by Schneider and Hacker (1973), it is shown that when college students are asked to bring in pictures to match chapter titles in a sociology book, those given titles such as "Political Man"

or "Urban Man" were significantly more likely to bring pictures of males than those students given titles such as "Political Behavior" or "Urban Life."

The strength of the imagery generated by the usages of "he," "him," "his," and "man" and "men" as gender-specific seem to be great enough that their associated mental images of "maleness" permeate all uses. It must be remembered that in our culture, the male/female distinction is of extreme importance, evoking strong imagery. We never forget whether the stranger we just had a conversation with was male or female.

The preponderance of the gender-specific usage is also a factor in imagery. Martyna (1980) says that in educational materials, for instance, the sex-specific "he" appears five to ten times for every single "generic" he.

Henley (1987) also cites studies where the use of "he" as a "generic" has far-reaching implications, adversely affecting comprehension of language, as well as attitudes towards women, and girls' self-esteem. Belief in the ability of females to perform a job is also affected negatively by the use of sexist language.

It also must be noted that the "ambiguity" at times served the purposes of those males in the bastions of power, when "men" really meant "males." Only a foolish Colonial woman would have thought that "all men are created equal" really included her (Frank & Anshen, 1983).

Arguments For

The arguments for teaching nonsexist language use fall into two categories. First, there are clear social implications for continuing to use and teach the use of sexist language.

But secondly, there is the equally strcng position of teaching precision in language use. Language teachers have the responsibility to teach usage that is unambiguous, clear, and concise. And there is nothing precise or graceful about referring to women and girls as "he" or "men."

Our language is constantly changing, adapting old usages (e.g. "money laundering"), and welcoming new terms to accommodate new concepts (e.g. "byte"), even when cumbersome (e.g. "superconducting supercollider"). We even borrow from other languages when there is no exact translation (e.g. "glasnost" and "perestroika"). We teach our students to search for the right words to exactly express their thoughts.

Given the research on language and imagery, or even only women's assertion that they feel excluded by such language, it must be acknowledged that sexist language such as discussed here is imprecise and ambiguous at best, and discriminatory and exclusionary at worst.

It should be clarified that the argument for nonsexist language usage is not an excuse for awkward prose. There are many examples given in guidelines and handbooks for

adequately handling the problem of the singular pronoun of indefinite reference. But it should be noted that even though casting a sentence into the plural is frequently the best solution, an occasional use of "he or she" or "he/she" is no more awkward than the use of "houses or cars" or "and/or," which are never cited as undesirable when used to precisely express a thought.

This particular type of language change both reflects and requires a fundamental change in the way that reality is structured, i.e., the male is not the standard of any species. It should be expected, then, that there will be some pauses for some writers to restructure thought and words in new ways, just as learners of English as a second language have to restructure their perspectives of reality to conform to differing cultural perspectives.

Brodkey (1989), an advocate of the theory that "words constitute world views," asserts that students and teachers who presume that written language "refers to a universal reality, independent of language, ... can argue that they bear no responsibility for the consequences of ... sexist ... language, since [it refers] to an already given reality that language only reflects" (p. 598).

There seems to be no question among those who study human behavior that there is a causal link from sexism in language to sexism in society, even when it is not the only cause. The American Psychological Association, in summarizing their 1975 statement on guidelines for nonsexist

use of language, says "By ignoring [sexist attitudes in research design and sexist language], the status quo is perpetuated, whereas responsible attention by psychologists to the style and content of their writing allows the profession to play an active part in creating human equality" (p. 684). Blaubergs (1980) says that whether "language merely reflects existing societal practices or contributes significantly to them, sexist language by its existence reinforces and socializes sexist thinking and practices" (p.137).

Arguments Against

The arguments against this language usage change are many. The first argument is that there is no need for change because "he" and "man" and their derivations are not misunderstood when used "generically." Those who hold this view would include those apathetic to the social implications of this usage and those whose personal political agendas are well served by it.

The second is the "preserve the status quo because it is sacred" argument. Some "language purists and linguistic sexists" (Henley, 1987) hold that sexist usage is "conventional and standard" and ought not be tampered with. They also criticize the common usage pattern of "they" as singular (considered by many to be disagreement in number) as more grievous than referring to females as "he" (unarguably disagreement in gender). In English, a language with "natural gender," it can be no more grammatical to

refer to females with "he" as it is to refer to males with "she." Those who hold this view rarely address the point that social inequities result from disagreement in gender but not from disagreement in number.

The usage of "they" to refer to singular antecedents is widespread in spoken English, across all social strata (Bodine, 1975). Its use is documented in Appendix C. It is even creeping into publication, as documented in Appendix E.

Another pair of arguments acknowledges the existence of sexism in language, but believes efforts to change it are unnecessary or impossible. Stern (1983), quoted in Appendix D, exemplifies those who believe they can nullify the effects of using sexist language by issuing a disclaimer, contending that declaring "he" to be "generic" makes it so.

Lakoff (1973), a feminist linguist deeply concerned with sexism, nevertheless believes that "an attempt to change pronominal usage will be futile," that it is an area of language which is too common, which is not available to "the native speakers' conscious awareness,... [therefore] less open to change" (p. 75). She believes that linguistic change will only follow social change, not facilitate it. She flatly states: "disparities exist in English...each reflects in its pattern of usage the differences between the role of women in our society and that of men" (p. 78). She recommends changing "only what can be changed, since that is hard enough" (p. 75). Blaubergs (1980) also quotes other

feminists who think that attention to sexist language change is superficial and trivial, and detracts from the real struggle, to end oppression of women.

Another argument which many people focus on is that a change would be too difficult and would necessarily result in inelegant and awkward prose. However, skilled users of English always find ways to express themselves gracefully and accurately, despite the many difficulties encountered in constructing English sentences. Wilga Rivers' (1983) On Communicating Naturally in a Second Language is a fine example of smooth writing, in which she does not address the point of sexist language at all, but merely does not use it, except when quoting others.

Mitchell (1979) expresses the concern that the effort to use nonsexist language will initiate a cascade of other linguistic difficulties. He laments the state of the language upon finding published, in a US Department of Transportation manual, the following sentence: "If a guest becomes intoxicated, you might take his or her car keys and send them home in a taxi" (p. 40). This problem of ambiguity of referent ("them" which could refer to keys) is a big one that teachers of English deal with all the time. It is not directly related to attempts to use nonsexist language.

McFadden (1981) considers the "persons suffixes" and "he/she's" to be "as distracting as a cloud of gnats, demanding that the reader note the writer's virtue" (p.297).

She reviles against extreme examples, such as reading aloud "he-slash-she" and using "waitperson" and "cowperson." However, she concedes,

> Redress may be due those of us who, though female, have answered to masculine referents all these years but slashing is not the answer; violence never is. Perhaps we could right matters by using feminine forms as the generic for a few centuries, or simply agree on a per-woman lump-sum payment (p. 298).

Another argument, that used as a "weasel clause" by the established order, exemplified by the Publications of the MLA in Appendix D, is that it would be a form of censorship to tell writers how to write. Henley (1987) eloquently responds that "One may also argue that it is women who have been censored out of language and that the switch to nonsexist forms is an attempt to remove that censorship rather than impose any" (p. 11).

It should be noted that those in this camp do not seem to object to other prescriptive grammarian rules pertaining to such things as double negatives, the use of "ain't," or racial epithets such as "nigger."

Although there do seem to be those who differ on the means to the same end, there is much truth to the statement by Stanley (cited in Blaubergs, 1980): "The arguments that favor man and mankind as generics are not substantive, but political" (p.136).

Author's Viewpoint

I believe that nonsexist language use should be a part of every English teacher's standards, because it is a precise form of language usage which furthers no special interest group's political agenda. Those who promote sexist usage should be called on to defend its underlying value system.

Good intentions are not enough (Martyna, 1980). When teachers tell their students "He who writes, speaks to the future," the girls are one step further from identifying with it than the boys. All are more likely to form a mental image of a male, pen in hand. Teachers must use the precise language needed to convey the message they want to send.

I believe that using "he" and "man" and their derivatives to refer to people (or animals) of both sexes should be considered as inaccurate as referring to "typewriters" as "mountains."

It is my position that in formal writing, a pronoun must agree both in number and in gender with its antecedent. Speech, however, is another matter. Despite centuries of systematic efforts to eradicate it, "singular they" is alive and well (Bodine, 1975). It has served the function well, facilitating clear communication. It is not for me to criticize speech patterns or dialects in which there is successful communication.

I contend that since the use of "they" to refer to one person of unspecified gender is widespread in the speech of

native English speakers, its use in speech should be taught to ESL students as one acceptable form. Celce-Murcia and Hilles (1988), in their book on teaching grammar to ESL students, advocate teaching "descriptive grammar," that is, the usage patterns of native speakers. To achieve "communicative competence," they advise teachers to disregard older prescriptive rules, such as using "shall" instead of "will" with "I" and "we," because it is not in current usage.

Bishop (1975), in his preface to The American Heritage Dictionary, quotes Samuel Johnson, who wrote in the preface to his 1755 Dictionary of the English Language,

"The pen must at length comply with the tongue."

References

APA Task Force on Issues of Sexual Bias in Graduate Education. (1975). Guidelines for nonsexist use of language. American Psychologist, 30, 682-684.

Bishop, M. (1975). Good usage, bad usage. In M. J. Hogan (Ed.), (1987). Words and the writer (pp. 73-81). Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Blaubergs, M. S. (1980). An analysis of classic arguments against changing sexist language. In C. Kramarae (Ed.), The voices and words of women and men (pp. 135-147). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Bodine, A. (1975). Androcentrism in prescriptive grammar: singular "they", sex-indefinite "he", and "he or she." Language in Society, 4, 129-146.

Brodkey, L. (1989). Transvaluing difference. College English, 51, 597-601.

Celce-Murcia, M. & Hilles, S. (1988). Techniques and resources in teaching grammar. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

Cheshire, J. (1985). A question of masculine bias. English Today 1, 22-26.

Donahue, E. (Ed.). (1964). The newstime funtime book. New York: Scholastic Books.

Frank, F. & Anshen, F. (1983). Of girls and chicks. In M. J. Hogan (Ed.), (1987). Words and the writer (pp. 284-295). Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Henley, N. M. (1987). This new species that seeks a new language: On sexism in language and language change. In J. Penfield (Ed.), Women and language in transition. Albany, NY: State Univ. of NY Press.

Lakoff, R. (1973). Language and woman's place. Language in Society, 2, 45-79.

Martyna, W. (1980). Beyond the "he/man" approach: The case for nonsexist language. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 5, 482-493.

McFadden, C. (1981). In defense of gender.In M. J. Hogan (Ed.), (1987). Words and the writer (pp. 297-300). Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Miller, C. & Swift, K. (1980). The handbook of nonsexist writing. New York: Lippincott & Crowell.

Mitchell, R. (1979). Trifles. In M. J. Hogan (Ed.), (1987). Words and the writer (pp. 40-48). Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Moulton, J. (1980). The myth of the neutral "man". In M. Vetterling-Braggin (Ed.), (1981). Sexist language: A modern philosophical analysis. Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Littlefield.

Rivers, W. (1983). Communicating naturally in a second language: Theory and practice in language teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Schneider, J. W. & Hacker, S. L. (1973). Sex role imagery and the use of the generic "man" in introductory texts: A case in the sociology of sociology. The American Sociologist, 8, 12-18.

Spender, D. (1985). Man made language (2nd ed.). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Stern, H. H. (1983). Fundamental concepts of language teaching. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.

Stevick, E. W. (1986). Images and options in the language classroom. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR FURTHER READING

Caywood, C. L. & Overing, G. R. (Eds.)(1987). Teaching Writing: Pedagogy, Gender, and Equity. Albany, NY: State Univ. of NY Press.

Frank, F. W. & Treichler, P. A. (1989). Language, Gender, and Professional Writing: Theoretical Approaches and Guidelines for Nonsexist Usage. New York: Modern Language Association.

Maggio, R. (1988). The Nonsexist Word Finder: A Dictionary of Gender-Free Usage. Boston: Beacon Press.

APPENDIX A
WHAT PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS, JOURNALS, AND STYLE MANUALS SAY

American Psychological Association (1983) Publication Manual:
"[In achieving] ... precise, unambiguous communication ... the guidelines on nonsexist language ... help authors recognize and change instances in which word choices may be inaccurate, misleading, or discriminatory. APA ... policy ... requires authors to use nonsexist language." (pp.43, 44) Includes 31 examples of common usage and nonsexist alternatives. Adopted in 1977.

Modern Language Association (1988) Handbook for Writers:
"...effective writing depends ... on clarity.... the challenge is to find the words ... that express your thoughts precisely.... another aspect ... [is] social connotations.... [a] careful writer avoids statements that imply unsubstantiated generalizations.... conscientious writers no longer use "he" to refer to someone of unspecified sex ... lest readers infer the statement apply only to a male...."(pp.33, 34)

American Anthropological Association, (1987)
--Publish American Anthropologist and Anthropology and Education Quarterly. "authors should avoid the unnecessary use of gender-specific language"

National Council of Teachers of English (1975)
--Publish College English and Teaching English in the Two-Year College, and others. Published 4 pages of guidelines for nonsexist use of language in publications, eliminating use of the "generic he."
"...the guidelines will also benefit ... [those] teaching in the classroom, assigning texts, determining curriculum..."

TESOL Quarterly (Journal of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, the primary US professional organization)
English Language Teaching Journal (Oxford, England)
Journal of Educational Psychology (APA, Washington, DC)
Journal of Educational Thought (Univ. of Calgary, Canada)
--all say that submissions should conform to the Publication Manual of APA (above), with the latter three making a point of saying that they edit out sexist language.

Chicago Manual of Style (1982) Sect. 2.92, p.61:
"...catch errors ... including ... sexist connotations"

Associated Press Stylebook and Libel Manual (1987)
"...copy should not assume maleness when both sexes are involved" (p.237) "[using] "man" or "mankind" [acceptable] when both sexes are involved" (p. 131)

APPENDIX B
WHAT TEXTBOOKS SAY

McGraw-Hill, a leader in textbooks for elementary and secondary schools, has prohibited sexist language since 1974.

Warriner's English Grammar and Composition (1982) New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich. A widely used text in middle and high schools, it avoids discussing the issue of "he" as a "generic," focusing only on problems involving agreement in number and objective vs. subjective cases. It does seem to be aware of nonsexist language in general, however, using "firefighter," and other "unconventional" references to women, such as "my mother and I are going on a camping trip" and using Elizabeth Blackwell (the first woman to graduate from a US medical school) as a topic for numerous sentences.

Heffernan & Lincoln's Writing -- A College Handbook (1986) New York: Norton. Used by UNM English 101 students and T-VI English 100 students. Has a section "Nonsexist Pronouns with Antecedents of Unspecified Gender," in which they say: "Not long ago, it was considered all right to say: 'a doctor ... he' But sentences like these are unfair to women. Saying his or he seems to imply that all doctors are men." It goes on to propose alternatives. It also discusses connotations of words, including cautions of sexual stereotyping.

Shea, Matthews, & Rogers (UNM faculty) have published Thought to Essay (1987, 1989) Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press. Used in UNM English 100 classes, and formerly at T-VI. It stands out as the exception, saying, "the form most widely agreed upon as simplest and most efficient is the conventional usage (he, his, him), both sexes herein included."

APPENDIX C
WHAT DICTIONARIES SAY

Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd ed., Unabridged, 1987.

"he: Usage: Traditionally, the masculine singular pronouns he, his, and him have been used generically to refer to indefinite pronouns like anyone, everyone, and someone and to singular nouns that can be applied to either sex.... This generic use is often criticized as sexist, although many speakers and writers continue the practice. Those who object to the generic use of he have developed various ways of avoiding it...."(p. 880)

"they: Usage: Long before the use of generic he was condemned as sexist, the pronouns they, their, and them were used in educated speech and in all but the most formal writing to refer to indefinite pronouns and to singular nouns of general personal reference, probably because such nouns are often not felt to be exclusively singular: 'If anyone calls, tell them I'll be back at six.' ... Such use is not a recent development, nor is it a mark of ignorance. Shakespeare, Swift, Shelley, Scott, and Dickens, as well as many other English and American writers, have used they and its forms to refer to singular antecedents. Already widespread in the language (though rejected as ungrammatical by some), this use of they, their, and them is increasing in all but the most conservatively edited American English. This increased use is at least partly impelled by the desire to avoid the sexist implications of he as a pronoun of general reference."(p. 1970)

"man: Usage: The use of man to mean 'human being,' both alone and in compounds such as mankind, has met with objection in recent years, and the use is declining. The objection is based on the idea that man is most commonly used as an exclusive, sex-marked noun meaning 'male human being.' Critics of the use of man as a generic maintain that it is sometimes ambiguous when the wider sense is intended ... but more often flatly discriminatory in that it slights or ignores the membership of women in the human race.... Although some editors and writers reject or disregard these objections to man as a generic, many now choose instead to use such terms as human beings..."(p.1166)

APPENDIX C cont'd.

Webster's Dictionary of English Usage, 1989.

"he, he or she: Many handbooks ... and other usage books ... have articles of varying length dealing with the problem of what third person singular pronoun to use in referring to a singular noun antecedent that can apply to either sex.... the prescribing of he as the generic third person singular seems to go back no further than ... 1795.... The use of generic he as a common-gender and common-number pronoun has lately been attacked as offensive by feminists and others. Bolinger (1980) points out that the problem was not discovered by feminists, but is an old one in the language.... The common solution has been to substitute the plural they (or them or their); even Chaucer used this dodge.... The use of the double pronoun he or she, him or her, his or her, is not recent either....[but] has the disadvantage of awkwardness, ... especially when a context calls for it repeatedly....We suggest you solve the difficulty in the was that seems the most natural to you in a given situation....Those who find the generic he natural will keep on using it. Those who do not will search for other solutions..."(p.499)

"they, their, them: The question of the propriety of using [these pronouns] to refer to indefinite pronouns and singular nouns ... relate to perceived gaps in the language.... As most commentators note, the traditional pronoun ... is the masculine third person singular, he, his, him. This tradition goes back to the 18th century grammarians, who boxed themselves into the position by first deciding that the indefinite pronouns [e.g. anyone, everyone] must always be singular. They then had to decide between the masculine and feminine singular pronouns for use in reference to the indefinites, and they chose the masculine (they were, of course, all men).... But the insistence on the masculine singular has its limitations. Sometimes its results are downright silly: '...everyone will be able to decide for himself whether or not to have an abortion -- Albert Bleumenthal, NY State Assembly (cited in Longman 1984)' ... the masculine pronoun is awkward at best used in reference to antecedents of both sexes: 'She and Louis had a game -- who could find the ugliest photograph of himself...-- J. L. Lash, Eleanor and Franklin' ... The examples here [many are given] of the "great ones" from Chaucer to the present are not lapses. They are uses following a normal pattern in English that was established four centuries before the 18th century grammarians ... The plural pronoun is one solution devised by native speakers of English to a grammatical problem inherent in that language -- and it is by no means the worst solution."(p. 901,902)

APPENDIX D
WHAT IS REALLY PUBLISHED

"Weasel clause" (Kernberger's term) issued in Publications of the Modern Language Association, 104, 814-816 against compliance with guidelines in MLA Handbook. Written by Claire Cook, copy editor on staff.
"...Beyond requiring standard English and formal consistency, we insist only on excising 'discriminatory' wording. Even in this matter, however, we allow some leeway. We don't routinely replace a generic man with person or an inexact his with his or her. We devote considerable time and effort to finding unobtrusive alternatives and then give the authors the option of devising their own solutions if ours are unacceptable.... In the end it is the writers who determine the words that will express their thoughts.... Readers ... should never stumble because they don't know what a pronoun stands for...."

Stern, H.H. (1983). Fundamental concepts of language teaching. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
Notes to Introduction (p. 5): "He/she? Him/her? While I accept the principle of 'nonsexist language' in scholarly writing commonly recommended in recent years, I have tried not to make much of an issue of it in this book and have used masculine forms 'he/his/him' etc. whenever they seemed natural and stylistically convenient on the argument that they can be understood as unmarked for sex unless otherwise indicated by the context."

Stevick, Earl. (1982). Teaching and learning languages. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
Footnote (p. 5): "The exclusive use of he, his, him in contexts like this perpetuates a tradition which is no longer acceptable. To use he and she (or she and he) and the corresponding double pronouns for possessive and objective forms is prohibitively awkward. No solution is likely to please everyone. My practice in this book will be to use the masculine forms in some chapters, feminine ones in others, and to envy the Turks, Japanese, and speakers of all other languages in which this issue does not arise."

Hall, E. T. (1959) The Silent Language, (1966) The Hidden Dimension, (1976) Beyond Culture, (1983) The Dance of Life. All Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
Uses "he" and "man" "generically" throughout all books. Seems surprising given his insightful observations on the inner workings of people in culture, and that he seems to be aware of different ways in which women experience life. There are ambiguities when he shifts between the "generic" and the "specific."

APPENDIX E
PUBLISHED EXAMPLES OF "THEY"
AS SINGULAR

Royko, Mike. (1989, November 6). When the night is a jungle, a woman needs a handgun. (syndicated through Chicago Tribune) The Albuquerque Tribune, C11.
"... Although it's not smart for a young woman to be outside at that hour in that neighborhood, anyone should be able to use the streets anytime they choose...."

Linthicum, Leslie. (1989, November 5). Wunderkind. Sage Magazine, Albuquerque Journal., p. 28.
"...many [parents] are happy to have their child remain in the regular classroom as long as they receive some sort of enrichment..."

APPENDIX F
WHAT ENGLISH TEACHERS DO

Information is from personal interviews, conducted during October and November, 1989. This list is not intended to be comprehensive, but rather is merely to show an assortment of approaches to the subject.

Lynn Beene, Assoc. Prof., UNM English Dept., Director of Freshman English: "I duck the issue. I tell students that to avoid offending their readers, they should cast into the plural, but that they can use 'he' if absolutely necessary." She says her students are either already politically aware or don't care about sexist language. Regards the PMLA as the "old guard," which adheres strictly to conservative established tradition.

Mike Hogan, Assoc. Prof., UNM English Dept., editor of Words and the Writer, 1987, used as English 101 text. Says that he tells students that "80% of the publications and professors they will be writing for still consider 'he' to be standard usage." Considers that NCTE passed guidelines for nonsexist writing strictly as a sociopolitical move, and that "English teachers are not involved in politics."

David Dunaway, Assoc. Prof., UNM English Dept., author of two published biographies. Teaches technical writing, in which he tells students that they must acknowledge the possibility of both genders in the beginning of their papers, but in contexts where the singular must be used later in the papers, can use only "he."

Kathleen Matthews, Asst. Prof., UNM Univ. College, co-author of Thought to Essay, 1989, used in English 100 classes at UNM and T-VI. Endorses "conventional usage of 'he'" in book. In the interview, said that they adopted that stance because they thought it was still acceptable in publishing. Seemed grateful to have the issue brought to her attention, and said that in future revisions, she will see that it is handled differently.

Kathleen Linnell, Instructor of English 102, UNM English Dept. Emphasizes consistency of pronoun use, even allowing "generic she," because she considers "he/she" and "he or she" awkward and rough. Does not consider the use of "he" as a "generic" to be nearly as basic and serious of an error as disagreement in number between pronoun and antecedent.

Susan Brill, Teaching Assistant, teaches English 101, UNM English Dept. Does not allow "he" as a generic, calls students' attention to implications of that usage, and refers to Heffernan & Lincoln's Handbook for authoritative backup.

APPENDIX F, Cont'd.

George Ann Gregory, teaches basic English usage at Learning Center, UNM-Gallup. Background in ESL, is a PhD. candidate in Ed.Linguistics. Says that she can easily apply "he" generically, and has no strongly male images when she reads it. Teaches students that it is completely acceptable, based on what she thinks others consider "standard usage."

Tasia Young, teaches management courses at Univ. of Phoenix and Webster Univ., in Albuquerque, former head of the NM Commission on the Status of Women, grad. student in Ed.Foundations. Makes notes to students about its implications when she sees "generic he," but does not lower grades on its use. Says her students are not terribly interested in any aspect of writing, let alone nonsexist usage. Feels there is "a lot to lose by pushing it very hard."

Ann Nihlen, Assoc. Prof., UNM, Dept. of Ed. Foundations. Absolutely does not allow "he" and "man" to be used generically in papers for her. Pleased with the American Anthropological Assn. position on the subject.